UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,982	08/21/2001	Todd Lagimonier	003636.0115	6823
	7590 07/23/200 NISON & SELTER PL	EXAMINER		
ATTN: William	n H Bollman	PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J		
2000 M Street I Suite700	NW .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, D	C 20016	2437		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/23/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)						
Office Action Summary			09/932,982	2	LAGIMONIER ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			MICHAEL F	PYZOCHA	2437				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur r Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN Insions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com- period for reply is specified above, the maximum stree to reply within the set or extended period for reply- eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period wi y will, by statute, of	TE OF THI 6(a). In no ever ill apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATIO t, however, may a reply be til expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this of the (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>09 .lul</i>	lv 2009						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 July 2009</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=		<i>'</i> —			osecution as to the	e merits is			
ت (۵	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4) X	Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the	application							
	Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are rejected.)⊡ Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or	election re	quirement					
		otion and or	CICCUIOTI TO	quiromont.					
	on Papers								
•	The specification is objected to by th			_					
10) 🔲	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ection to the d	Irawing(s) be	held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) 🔲	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some col None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Fination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal R 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 09/932,982 Page 2

Art Unit: 2437

5

10

20

25

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-43 are pending.

2. Amendment filed 07/09/2009 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 15 Milliken (US 6978384) in view of Chiu et al. (US 6505253).

As per claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 36, Milliken discloses determining a largest nonce value yet seen from a plurality of nonce values of out-of-order messages (see column 8 lines 64-65); comparing a nonce value of a received message with said largest nonce value yet seen (see column 8 line 65); comparing said nonce value to an acceptance window in response to said nonce value not exceeding said largest nonce value yet seen (see column 9 lines 31-453); adjusting a range of acceptable nonce values within said acceptance window (see column 3 lines 56-61 and column 9 lines 1-30); rejecting said received message in response to said nonce value falling outside said acceptance window; in a secure peer to peer communication (see column 9 lines 31-42).

Art Unit: 2437

5

10

15

20

Milliken fails to explicitly disclose adjusting the size of the window based on the largest nonce value yet seen.

However, Chiu et al. teaches a sliding window with a varying size based on the largest nonce value yet seen (see column 32 lines 40-61).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to vary the size of the window in the Milliken system.

Motivation to do so would have been to control the congestion in a connection (see Chiu et al. column 32 lines 40-61).

As per claims 2, 3, 11, 13, 20, 21, 29, and 37, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses designating said nonce value as said largest nonce value yet seen in response to said nonce value exceeding said largest nonce value yet seen (see Milliken column 9 lines 1-30).

As per claims 4, 12, 22, 30, and 38, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses adjusting an acceptance window based on said nonce value exceeding said largest nonce value yet seen (see Milliken column 9 lines 1-30).

As per claims 5, 7, 14, 16, 23, 25, 32, 34, 40, and 42, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses designating said received message as a replay attack (see Milliken column 3 lines 50-67).

As per claims 6, 8, 15, 17, 24, 26, 33, and 41, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses comparing said nonce value to a window mask value in response to said nonce value falling within said acceptance window; rejecting said received

Art Unit: 2437

message in response to an outcome of said comparison of said nonce value to said window mask value being true (see Milliken column 9 lines 31-53).

As per claims 9, 18, and 27, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses designating said nonce value as a larges nonce value seen (see Milliken column 9 lines 1-30).

As per claims 31 and 39, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses said secure communication module is further configured to reject said received packet in response to said nonce value falling outside said filter (see Milliken column 9 lines 31-53).

As per claims 35 and 43, the modified Milliken and Chiu et al. system discloses said secure communication module is further configured to reject said received packet in response to said nonce value fails to fall within said filter and said secure communication module is further configured to designate said received packet as part of a replay attack (see Milliken column 3 lines 50-67 and column 9 lines 31-53).

15

10

5

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

20

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 09/932,982 Page 5

Art Unit: 2437

(571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/ Examiner, Art Unit 2437

15

5

10